

If Donald Trump intends to continue this injustice by covering his ears and pretending we are silent, let this bipartisan discharge petition serve as a blaring beacon that even he cannot ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make the moral decision to pass this necessary humanitarian legislation, protect our Haitian neighbors from certain devastation, and vote “yes” on this resolution.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of extending temporary protective status for Haitian nationals living in the United States.

I am proud to represent Orlando, Florida, where one of the largest populations of Haitians live in the country. They are facing a humanitarian disaster and crisis, and we are facing a clear humanitarian and policy problem.

Haiti remains in the midst of a severe crisis, unlike anything we can find in the entire world. While hundreds of thousands of Haitian nationals live in the United States, Haiti remains in severe crisis and a horrible humanitarian situation. Hundreds of thousands of Haitian nationals in the United States are living and working under temporary protective status, and now that is at risk.

Conditions in Haiti are not safe to return. Armed groups control parts of the country. Access to food, medical care, and basic security remains deeply unstable. Deporting or forcing families to return under these conditions would be dangerous and unjust.

At the same time, Haitian TPS holders are fully integrated into our communities and societies. They are working, raising families, and contributing to our economy and neighborhoods every day.

The question before us is whether we allow this uncertainty and instability to continue or whether we will act. That is where this discharge petition comes in. The normal legislative process has failed to move this important issue forward, but this discharge petition has succeeded in forcing the House to finally consider legislation to extend TPS for more than 350,000 Haitian nationals. It is important we keep that in mind.

If we fail to move this forward, we are talking about expelling 350,000 of our neighbors to a country that is deeply unstable and dangerous.

By signing this petition, my colleagues have already recognized the urgency of the issue. Now it is time to follow through with action. A vote in favor of this measure provides stability for families, communities, and for critical parts of our workforce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FROST. A vote in favor of this measure provides stability to families for communities and critical parts of

our workforce. A vote against it sends people into conditions that we know are unsafe.

This work does not end here. We hope that in the future we can do the same thing for Venezuelan nationals. I am proud to be a part of this fight right now following the leadership of Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. A vote against this resolution is a vote against our country’s best interests, plain and simple, but don’t just take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Republicans in the executive branch agree.

If you go to the State Department’s website, you will see the Trump administration has designated Haiti as a “Level 4: Do not travel (Code Red)” because of the multilayered humanitarian crises of natural disasters, gang violence, and political instability impacting the island.

That is why TPS is warranted in this moment, and Secretary Rubio knows that. In fact, when he was in the Senate, it was Rubio who authored the very legislation we are voting on today.

□ 1410

It is not just him who agrees. The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mike Waltz, has repeatedly discussed the dire conditions of Haiti and its strategic importance to our national security.

Ambassador Waltz, who was recently a Republican in this very body, believes we should be working to stabilize Haiti. He knows that the international effort to restore order in Port-au-Prince would be undermined if we deported hundreds of thousands of Haitians to the island.

This isn’t just about foreign policy. Secretary Kennedy of the Department of Health and Human Services said something families across the country already know too well: America is facing a caregiver crisis. If we were to deport Haitians, we would lose even more nurses, aides, and caregivers that we desperately need. Those jobs can’t be replaced by AI. The solution is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” to extend TPS because it is the economic thing to do. It is the strategic thing to do. It is the humane thing to do. But most of all, it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NON-ATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6409

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability Act” or the “FENCES Act”.

SEC. 2. EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF EMISSIONS COVERED.—Section 179B of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509a) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity)” after “but for emissions emanating from outside of the United States” each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “(regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity)” after “but for emissions emanating from outside the United States”.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 179B of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509a) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DESIGNATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an area within a State may not be designated as a nonattainment area with respect to any new or revised primary or secondary national ambient air quality standard for a pollutant if such State establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such area would be in attainment with such national ambient air quality standard for such pollutant but for emissions emanating from outside of the United States (regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity).”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS AND FEES IF EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.—The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 179B the following new section:

“SEC. 179C. APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS AND FEES IF EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, with respect to any nonattainment area that is classified under section 181 as a Severe Area or an Extreme Area for ozone or under section 188 as a Serious Area for particulate matter, no sanction or fee under section 179 or 185 shall apply with respect to a State (or an area or source therein) on the basis of a deficiency described in section 179(a), or the failure to attain a national ambient air quality standard for ozone or particulate matter by the applicable attainment date, if the State demonstrates that the State would have avoided such deficiency, or such standard would have been attained, but for one or more of the following:

“(1) Emissions emanating from outside the nonattainment area.

“(2) Emissions from an exceptional event (as defined in section 319(b)(1)).

“(3) Emissions from mobile sources to the extent the State demonstrates that—

“(A) such emissions are beyond the control of the State to reduce or eliminate; and

“(B) the State is fully implementing such measures as are within the authority of the State to control emissions from the mobile sources.

“(b) NO EFFECT ON UNDERLYING STANDARDS.—The inapplicability of sanctions or fees with respect to a State (or an area or source therein) pursuant to subsection (a) does not affect the obligation of a State, area, source, or other entity under other provisions of this Act to establish and implement measures to attain a national ambient air quality standard for ozone or particulate matter.

“(c) PERIODIC RENEWAL OF DEMONSTRATION.—For subsection (a) to continue to apply with respect to a State (or an area or source therein), the State involved shall renew the demonstration required by subsection (a) at least once every 5 years.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6409.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act, which addresses the need for commonsense reforms on how emissions impact our Nation's ability to support domestic manufacturing and unleash affordable and reliable energy.

For far too long, burdensome regulations have stood in the way, allowing investments to go overseas while Americans are forced to pay higher prices. Many of these costly regulations result from regulatory burdens associated with the Clean Air Act.

The legislation considered today makes targeted and effective reforms that will support American job creators while continuing to protect our environment and the air we breathe.

The legislation produced by my colleague Congressman AUGUST PFLUGER of Texas ensures that States and local communities are not penalized for foreign air emissions emanating from outside our borders. Across the country, States are being unfairly penalized for pollution that originates from foreign nations, including air emissions from natural events, like the Canadian wildfires.

Currently, the Clean Air Act allows States to adjust their plans when foreign emissions prevent them from meeting Federal standards. However, the guidance from the EPA under the previous administration narrowed that relief, limiting it to only human-caused emissions from abroad.

This bill clarifies that all foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are excluded from consideration when determining whether a State meets national air quality standards.

Importantly, the bill allows States to account for foreign emissions earlier in the regulatory process, instead of forcing them to wait until the very end and risk costly delays or Federal sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting these bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

Access to quality and affordable healthcare is an issue at the top of many Americans' minds right now as they struggle through the ever-worsening Republican affordability crisis. Republicans have demonstrated over the last year that they have no interest in improving healthcare for the American people.

The Republican big, ugly bill cut more than a trillion dollars from Americans' healthcare. Insurance premiums spiked at the beginning of the year for 20 million people because Republicans refused to extend the ACA tax credits. Fifteen million people are predicted to lose their healthcare altogether. Hospitals are closing in record numbers around the country.

There was a media report just yesterday that said 15 hospitals in my State of New Jersey have the potential to close because of the Republican big, ugly bill and the impact on hospitals.

Now, there are reports that Republicans intend to make further cuts and take healthcare away from more people to pay for Trump's reckless war of choice with Iran. In Trump's America, we can't afford healthcare, but apparently, we can spend a billion dollars a day on the war in Iran. In fact, Trump himself said that it is not possible for the Federal Government to pay for Medicaid and Medicare when we are fighting wars.

Republican attacks on Americans' healthcare continue this week here on the House floor by bringing three dirty air bills to the House floor, including this bill, H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; and also H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and, finally, H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act.

These bills are an attack on the public health protections that are a cornerstone of the Clean Air Act. They will ultimately make Americans sicker and increase healthcare costs even more.

The health harms of air pollution are well-documented, being felt by communities across the country. Communities

in areas with unsafe levels of air pollution see more diagnoses of diseases like asthma, COPD, heart disease, and certain types of cancer, all of which require long-term treatment and medication.

Air pollution, Mr. Speaker, is also responsible for over 100,000 premature deaths every year. It is ridiculous to even consider these bills when our constituents are demanding action on healthcare affordability.

Whether it is from reducing transparency, to artificially reducing air pollution reporting by ignoring climate change, to giving corporate polluters free passes on Clean Air Act requirements, these bills are evidence that Republicans are more interested in helping their pollution friends than the well-being of Americans.

The bill that we are talking about now, the FENCES Act, would undercut the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or NAAQS, which tells us the amount of air pollution that is safe to breathe.

□ 1420

The bill would have us ignore bad air quality in areas that experience any pollution beyond the jurisdiction of a State or city's borders. It removes the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to impose fees or sanctions on States that fail to make progress toward cleaning up the air.

Let me just explain this. If my hometown of Long Branch or my county of Monmouth or my State of New Jersey was getting pollution from outside that particular jurisdiction, it wouldn't count. They wouldn't have to account for that in terms of dealing with air pollution and trying to reduce it. To me, that is patently ridiculous because we know that air pollution travels across cities, across States, and even across countries. Giving States that are not even trying to improve air quality a free pass for pollution without any incentive to fix the problem is not the right way to proceed, and that is what this bill does.

If signed into law, this bill would require EPA to cook the books on air pollution in favor of industry, removing all accountability for States to clean up air pollution and leaving millions of Americans to breathe unhealthy air. The only winners here are corporate polluters who would get to save a few dollars in compliance costs.

Now Republican attempts to undermine the NAAQS aren't new. Every time the EPA strengthens an air quality standard, opponents complain that stronger public health standards will limit economic growth, but that has never been true, Mr. Speaker. Every time, industry has innovated better pollution control measures to meet the new standards.

Republicans also claim that the FENCES Act is part of their permitting reform effort, but this bill would not speed up any permitting. In fact, it

would cause complete permitting gridlock in areas with pollution that exceeds an air quality standard. This is not permitting reform.

House Republicans are trying to use accounting gimmicks to make areas with poor air quality appear much better to benefit corporate polluters at the expense of the health of Americans across the country. Pushing the FENCES Act at a moment when millions of Americans are struggling to afford their utilities, their groceries, and healthcare, in my opinion, is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to me to hear my Democratic colleagues talk about where Republicans are on healthcare when, in fact, it was Republicans who initiated the \$50 billion Rural Health Transformation Fund that every Democrat voted against.

As a matter of fact, just this year, the State of New Jersey is going to get \$147,250,806 from the Rural Health Transformation Fund. I think that is a pretty good investment in trying to improve healthcare for people all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability Act, also known as the FENCES Act.

States and communities are being pushed into nonattainment because of pollution that they don't control and they can't prevent. As was just mentioned by my colleague from New Jersey who said that we can't control pollution across borders, that is right. That is why we have to come up with this bill.

Smoke from Canadian wildfires, emissions drifting across our southern border, and other foreign sources can overwhelm local air quality readings even when the States are fully compliant and acting in good faith.

Congress has long recognized this reality. That is why the Clean Air Act allows States to account for foreign emissions when those emissions interfere with attainment, but that balance was disrupted when EPA guidance under the Biden administration sharply narrowed what counts as foreign emissions, limiting relief to certain human-caused sources while excluding events like wildfires. That distinction was arbitrary and unworkable. States cannot regulate another country, and they certainly cannot regulate natural disasters.

The FENCES Act corrects that mistake. In fact, let me change that phrasing. The FENCES Act corrects that overreach by the previous administration. It clarifies that all foreign emis-

sions, whether natural or human caused, must be excluded when the EPA makes nonattainment determinations or reviews new source permits. Just as important, the bill allows States to raise these issues earlier in the process rather than years after the planning and investment have happened when the consequences are most severe.

Those consequences are significant. Nonattainment designations impose substantial regulatory burdens on States, communities, energy producers, and manufacturers. They trigger stricter permitting requirements, delay infrastructure projects, and raise the costs for businesses trying to expand or hire. For energy producers, it means slower approvals for drilling and processing. For manufacturers, it means uncertainty around whether a project will even move forward. For local communities, it means fewer jobs and less investment, even when they have done everything right to comply with the law.

The issue is not theoretical. In my area, the Permian Basin, we saw how even the possibility, the threatening of a nonattainment designation can create uncertainty. That uncertainty affects permitting timelines, capital planning, and long-term investment decisions for both producers and local communities. Companies begin to question whether new jobs will face delays or additional requirements, and local leaders are left planning around an unclear regulatory future. When the stakes are that high, EPA needs to get the analysis right. That is the way the law was written, and this bill gets us back to that intent.

It was said that this bill favors the dirty production in manufacturing and lowers the air quality. No, it actually holds our communities accountable. It holds them accountable, the communities that we care about domestically that should be held accountable, but shouldn't be penalized for cities in Mexico or wildfires that are happening in Canada or other foreign sources that they don't control. That is what this bill does.

When the Supreme Court decided on the Loper Bright case, that is the Chevron deference case, this is the decision they had in mind because the Biden administration overreached so often and so critically.

This bill is a targeted, commonsense measure that does not change air quality standards. In fact, it actually enforces them more accurately within our local communities, and it makes a narrow adjustment to ensure that compliance determinations are fair by excluding foreign emissions from EPA nonattainment designations.

American workers and businesses should not face regulatory penalties for pollution originating outside our borders or for uncontrollable natural events. I urge my colleagues to think about a commonsense solution and to get back to the intent of the law,

which is exactly what the FENCES Act does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated this bill in committee, I was reminded of the environmental history of the Adirondack Mountains, which are located just to the north of my district in upstate New York. The Adirondacks are known for their beauty as well as the ecological damage they suffered from acid rain.

That acid rain was caused by polluting power plants in the Midwest, and that pollution didn't stop in upstate New York. It also harmed people and the environment in eastern Canada. The international pressure brought by the Canadian Government helped motivate the Bush administration and Congress to enact the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, which included a program to control sources of acid rain pollution.

In that case, American industries were the polluters, but it demonstrates how international cooperation in pursuit of our common environmental goals is, indeed, possible.

States and counties burdened by foreign pollution sources should be able to rely upon their Federal Government to address these issues through bilateral discussions with the polluting country. We should be able to have a bipartisan consensus in Congress that we would like our environmental and diplomatic efforts to prioritize these issues in our international relations.

Of course, it should be a national imperative that we collectively demand polluters in Mexico, China, or any other country that may be proven to be contributing to an area's nonattainment of a Clean Air Act standard, to do something to control their pollution.

I understand that States and counties may be frustrated by pollution sources from outside their jurisdiction, but the lungs of the people living and working in those areas don't care from whence that pollution originated. It affects their health all the same.

I don't think the answer can be to simply ignore the problem of Americans breathing unsafe levels of air pollution. States and local air agencies should continue to work with EPA to find ways to better protect people by also allowing for opportunities to prove when emissions originate from outside their borders.

Thankfully, that is already how the Clean Air Act works, making this bill unnecessary. Section 179B of the Clean Air Act currently gives States that opportunity to prove emissions came from an international source and provides regulatory relief when an area would have otherwise achieved the National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

□ 1430

Instead, this bill allows States to completely ignore international pollution in their State implementation plans, and it provides free passes on pollution that comes from outside the area, from exceptional events, and from mobile-source pollution.

The bill blocks EPA's ability to impose sanctions on States that fail to make progress toward reducing air pollution, including States that are not even trying to improve air quality.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should be working to better protect our constituents from having to breathe pollution from foreign sources, but pretending that pollution doesn't exist simply cannot be the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), a distinguished Member.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the FENCES Act, a commonsense bill that brings fairness and clarity to how we evaluate air quality in the United States.

In California, our communities are already working hard to meet some of the most stringent environmental standards in the country. Yet, too often, they are penalized for factors completely outside of their control, like pollution or wildfire smoke that comes from outside our borders.

The FENCES Act clarifies that emissions coming from other countries, whether caused by human activity or natural events, cannot be used to determine whether a State is meeting Federal air quality standards. The bill also strengthens existing law under the Clean Air Act by allowing States to account for foreign emissions earlier in the process rather than waiting until final stages of their State implementation plans. For California, wherein nonattainment designations can have serious economic consequences, reliability is important.

Right now, businesses across Central Valley and across our State face significant permitting delays and regulatory uncertainty. I hear from small businesses all the time who want to invest and hire in our region, but they are stuck navigating a system that doesn't reflect today's global realities.

In some cases, these challenges actually push investment overseas to countries with much weaker environmental standards, which ultimately undermines the very goal that we are trying to achieve here in the United States. I think we can all agree that we want our communities to be healthy while also providing opportunities for economic investment.

The FENCES Act helps to provide a level playing field by providing regulatory clarity, streamlining the permitting process, and giving States like California a fair shot at compliance, while still maintaining our commitment to clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which strikes the balance between reasonable environmental standards and allowing industry to invest in America to help build our economy and create jobs.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN), a member of our committee.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, America is in the middle of a healthcare crisis. More and more Americans can't afford their healthcare. They just can't pay for it. Hospitals are cutting back services. Many of them are closing their doors.

Then, Trump and congressional Republicans made things much worse when they spent trillions of dollars on tax cuts that mostly benefited the wealthy. To pay for it, they kicked about 15 million Americans off of their health insurance, a cut of approximately \$1 trillion to healthcare for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Then, they refused to give 24 million Americans a break on buying healthcare, and now this. This week, congressional Republicans are bringing three bills to the floor that will make it harder for people to breathe.

One of those bills, the so-called FENCES Act, directs the EPA to use accounting gimmicks that will allow industries to pollute our air without consequences. It is an air pollution bill.

This bill will make Americans sicker while Trump and congressional Republicans have cut healthcare for millions of Americans. Congress should be focused entirely on expanding healthcare and protecting our air and water. Fortunately, the Senate won't take these bills up, and they are not going anywhere.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about Republican positions on healthcare. I will remind them again that, in particular, the State of Ohio received \$202,030,262 from the Rural Health Transformation Fund that every Democrat voted against. I remind my colleagues that the Republicans have made a major investment in healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Alabama for yielding, and I appreciate his hard work going into the Rural Transformation Healthcare Fund that was in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. The gentleman originated the idea, and we certainly appreciate his hard work on that.

Today, I rise to support H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act.

These three bills are an essential part of the committee's broader efforts on permitting reform and aligned with

the White House permitting priorities, which include modernizing the Clean Air Act.

A lot has changed since 1990, the last time that the Clean Air Act got a substantial overhaul. Some parts of the law have become outdated, contributing to the regulatory gridlock that is stifling American growth and innovation.

A lot has changed since 1990, the last time the Clean Air Act got a substantial overhaul, and some parts of the law have become outdated, contributing also to more gridlock.

These bills are foundational to our permitting reform efforts because they illustrate ways that we protect public health and the environment while removing outdated provisions that are slowing energy production and manufacturing, ultimately preventing job creation.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held multiple hearings this Congress on the process for establishing and implementing national air quality standards and improving the preconstruction permitting program without sacrificing environmental protections. Some of the most expensive and significant barriers in the permitting process are the result of the law's outdated provisions.

What is worse, these burdensome requirements fail to address the most significant sources of pollution and create disincentives for companies to invest in cost-efficient and effective technology that would actually improve air quality.

In the U.S., it takes 80 percent longer to permit projects than elsewhere in the world. America's outdated permitting system costs manufacturers in the U.S. approximately \$7.9 billion each year. While a reasonable level of permitting is, of course, needed, without commonsense reforms, our Nation risks falling behind our adversaries, like China.

Notably, over 70 percent of projects require Clean Air Act permits, which have the most burdensome approval process of any permitting requirement. Notably, over 70 percent of projects require these permits, and these three bills remove regulatory uncertainty and bureaucratic hoops that impact what and where job creators build new businesses, but they do not change the underlying environmental protections in the law.

The FENCES Act introduced by Congressman PFLUGER ensures that States and local communities are not penalized for foreign air emissions emanating from outside of the U.S. The FENCES Act clarifies that all foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are not considered when determining whether a State meets national air quality standards.

The FENCES Act protects manufacturers and communities from unnecessary compliance burdens caused by events beyond their control, such as pollution from China, foreign wildfires,

or dust storms, while upholding environmental standards under the Clean Air Act.

The RED Tape Act, introduced by Congressman JOYCE, eliminates a duplicative environmental review for projects already subject to NEPA environmental review. The duplicative process leads to additional delays and costs in the NEPA process.

The FIRE Act, introduced by Congressman GABE EVANS and co-led by Congressman ADAM GRAY, updates the Clean Air Act to address the biggest threat in air pollution that this country faces today: wildfires. Bipartisan legislation ensures that States are not punished for prescribed burns or emissions that they cannot control.

Prescribed burns are the most effective tool to decrease the severity of wildfires and public health problems associated with wildfire smoke. Despite the widespread acceptance of benefits of prescribed burns, they are underutilized across the U.S. due to perverse regulatory burdens under current air quality laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act. These bills provide commonsense solutions and long-needed updates to the Clean Air Act.

□ 1440

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFE).

Mr. MENEFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PALLONE for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of the FENCES Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about protecting public health and the environment and without sacrificing environmental protection in this country, but I want to point out that it is this administration currently in office that has eviscerated the EPA. Time after time, we have seen these bills filed that are intended to weaken our environmental protection.

Let me be clear about what the FENCES Act actually does. It weakens the Clean Air Act. It removes the EPA's ability to hold States accountable when they fail to reduce air pollution, and it gives polluters a free pass in communities that can least afford it. I represent Houston, Texas. In my district, environmental justice is not a talking point; it is a reality that people wake up to each and every day.

We have communities that have some of the highest concentrations of industrial pollution in the entire country: communities with more than five polluting facilities in a 2-mile radius, cancer clusters, high rates of lung disease and heart disease, lower life expectancies, children and seniors breathing in some of the most contaminated air in America.

These communities don't need us here in Washington making it worse. I

know firsthand what happens when you take the pressure off of State environmental regulators.

Before I came to Congress, I served as the chief legal officer for Harris County, the largest county in Texas. I watched the State's environmental regulators look the other way when pollution ran rampant in underserved communities.

They sat on cancer clusters. They let polluting facilities concentrate in neighborhoods that had no political power to fight back, and they handed passes to industry while residents got sick. I had to sue them to get them to act, but that is not how our government should work.

The Federal Government has to hold these folks accountable when they put industry over people and put our communities' health at risk, but this bill would add yet another obstacle to holding those in power accountable.

Here is what the FENCES Act actually does. Under current law, States already get credit when pollution blows in from other countries or from out of State. They are not penalized for pollution that they cannot control. That protection exists today.

This bill doesn't fix a gap. It tears open a new one. It expands that exemption so broadly that States can point to foreign pollution as a reason to stop making progress on air quality altogether.

It removes the EPA's ability to hold them accountable. It is a built-in excuse to look the other way. State regulators and polluters both know exactly how to exploit it, and they will.

That is why I tried to change this bill by submitting an amendment. It said one simple thing: that before this law takes effect, the Secretary of Health and Human Services must certify that the impacts will not harm children and the elderly. That is it. Prove that this is safe for our kids and our seniors before it takes effect.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked it. They would not allow that vote. They couldn't say yes to that because this bill was never about clean air. It is about giving corporate polluters cover while the people in our districts pay with their health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Utah). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MENEFE. Over 100 million Americans already live in counties with unhealthy air quality. Air pollution contributes to more than 100,000 premature deaths in this country each and every year. The people in our communities are not abstractions. They are already on the wrong side of these numbers.

This body lets pollution run rampant as our communities see poison in the wind that blows and wonder "Where did all the blue skies go?"

We should be standing up to make sure that every single person in our

communities has clean land, clean air, and clean water, regardless of their ZIP Code or socioeconomic status.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the FENCES Act.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the situation that people in rural America find themselves in. What we tried to do with the One Big Beautiful Bill Act with the Rural Health Transformation Fund was meet a lot of those needs. The State of Texas got more money than any other State, \$281,319,361, to try to improve healthcare opportunities for people who live in disadvantaged areas. What we are also trying to do is improve those conditions, to give people an opportunity to have a better job, to have better options in food, and have better healthcare options, as well. That is a big part of what we are trying to do with the modernization of the Clean Air Act and these bills that we bring before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI).

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALMER for yielding me time to speak in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

This commonsense legislation ensures that American communities and manufacturers are not penalized for pollution that they cannot control. Emissions from foreign countries, wildfires, and dust storms should not determine whether our States meet Federal air quality standards.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by clarifying that foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are excluded from compliance determinations and permitting decisions. It also allows States to account for these emissions earlier in the regulatory process, providing certainty and preventing costly delays.

For border communities like those that I represent in southern Arizona, this is about fairness. Our districts should not face economic penalties for pollution originating beyond our own borders.

The FENCES Act strengthens regulatory certainty, supports American jobs, and upholds our Nation's environmental standards. It is also widely supported by the business community and will ensure we are creating an environment in which industry can thrive.

I strongly believe that when we manufacture here in America, we do it better and cleaner than anywhere else in the world, and this legislation is essential in supporting American innovation and excellence across a wide variety of sectors, from mining to chips manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. DEXTER).

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and vehement opposition to these bills, specifically the FENCES Act, that gut the Clean Air Act's core public health protections.

Before the Clean Air Act was passed in 1970, pollution choked American cities. It blanketed entire communities in a toxic haze so thick that residents were reported to believe they were under chemical attack.

In Los Angeles, people had smog-burned eyes and seared lungs. In my hometown of Portland, an industrial hub, smokestacks filled the skies with black plumes. Children walked to school clutching handkerchiefs over their faces. Drivers crashed on the highway because they couldn't see more than a few feet ahead. Families were scared. They were sick, and they were desperate for change.

That is the reality my Republican colleagues are now trying to drag us back to. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards are one of the most important tools we have to protect health. They set limits on dangerous pollution and ensure communities know when the air they breathe is unsafe. These bills would undermine those standards, allowing States to sidestep them and leave the public in the dark about real health risks.

As a lung doctor, I know exactly what that means. It means more asthma attacks, more heart attacks, more strokes, more cancer diagnoses, and more children in the ER.

We have seen this play out time and time again, and today, I cannot help but wonder when are we going to learn our lesson.

In places like Cancer Alley, families wake up every day knowing the air they breathe is making them sick. Communities are living with higher rates of cancer, respiratory illness, and premature death—real people, real families bearing the cost of decisions made right here.

It is not just one place. Across the country, in communities living near the major sources of pollution, we see the same pattern. When standards are weakened and accountability disappears, people pay with their health.

This is not what the people of Oregon sent me here to do. They sent me here to fight for healthy communities, for clean air, for safe water, and a better future for our children.

I will not sit silently while this body rolls back lifesaving protections that have put polluters on watch. I urge my colleagues to reject these bills. Our children are watching. History is watching, and the air we breathe is on the line.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

Washington has ignored a simple fact that every Arizonan knows firsthand.

Eighty percent of the air pollution in Maricopa County, Arizona's largest county, with a population of approximately 5.5 million people, is caused by natural phenomena or international transport.

Wildfire smoke from California, Canada, and Mexico, dust storms across the desert, and emissions drifting in from China and Mexico are all outside our control. Yet Arizona was penalized with stricter Federal mandates, threatening jobs and growth in one of the fastest growing regions in America.

That makes no sense because Arizona—and Maricopa County specifically—is home to economic and technological development that will better the lives of Arizonans and Americans nationwide.

□ 1450

From semiconductor manufacturing to aerospace and national defense facilities, Arizona is building the industries that keep America competitive.

These employers depend on fair, predictable permitting, not rules that punish us for pollution blowing in from another country.

Arizona's leaders have invested in real outreach and compliance tools that have cut controllable emissions by 50 percent since 2000, but no State should be forced to impose more regulations on families and small businesses for pollution that they did not cause nor can they remedy. That is exactly where the FENCES Act is necessary.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by making clear that all foreign emissions, natural or man-made, are excluded when EPA conducts air quality reviews.

Democrats would continue to penalize States like Arizona for these uncontrollable sources. Democrats want to continue to impose costly delays, Federal sanctions, and unnecessary burdens on manufacturers, communities, and States.

Earlier this year, President Trump and EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin recognized the impact of these onerous rules and stopped their negative effects in Maricopa County, but no State should have to rely on the unpredictability and capriciousness of any administration.

Congress must act so that no future EPA can arbitrarily punish Arizona or any State for emissions beyond our borders.

The FENCES Act is grounded in sound science and common sense. It protects jobs, supports investment, and ensures environmental rules focus on what States can actually control.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the FENCES Act. Let's pass it today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN).

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6409, the

FENCES Act, which would gut the Clean Air Act.

For over 60 years, the Clean Air Act has stood as our Nation's landmark air pollution law, serving as our most effective tool to try to keep the air that our children and families breathe safe and to hold polluters accountable.

Despite this achievement, we still have more than 100,000 people prematurely dying in the United States every year because of air pollution. That is simply unacceptable.

We should be building on the progress of the Clean Air Act, not gutting it. We should be decarbonizing transportation, regulating carbon emissions, acknowledging that climate change is happening and that the science is real, and trying to improve air quality and reduce the climate trends that we are seeing that are so alarming. Instead, we are debating another bill that would give yet another free pass to corporations and billionaires at the expense of working families.

I understand my colleagues across the aisle are debating right now, and will introduce later today, a bill to rename the big, ugly bill to something maybe more palatable to the masses. They are doing that because the big, ugly bill is so unpopular right now that they are trying to run away from it as fast as possible.

I have a news flash for y'all. It is not the name that is the problem. It is the substance of the bill that helps, again, the Epstein elites that y'all are protecting so hard. It does so at the expense of the working class—in this case, with the FENCES Act gutting the Clean Air Act and polluting our air and water.

The bill before us today is yet another attack on the Clean Air Act that we cannot afford. The FENCES Act would pave the way for States to avoid their responsibility to improve air quality and protect public health by claiming air pollution in their State as a foreign source.

This bill is completely unnecessary because, under current law, States are not penalized for pollution they can't control, such as from foreign sources or other States. This is a solution in search of a problem.

It is important to remember that air pollution doesn't vanish when we don't see it. It moves across national borders and has deadly impacts on Americans here at home.

As a reminder, not too long ago, in the 1960s and 1970s, Los Angeles, just up the 405 from where I live in Orange County, was one of the most polluted cities in the world, with smog so pervasive that people reported burning eyes and extremely low visibility.

Because of landmark laws like the Clean Air Act and efforts by State and local governments, air pollution in Los Angeles has been significantly reduced, driving down chronic health impacts and having notable and statistically proven quality-of-life improvements for millions of Californians in southern California.

For these reasons, at the appropriate time, I plan to offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would ensure that this bill does not go into effect until the EPA and Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee certify that the act will not increase health harms or the costs associated with treating those harms.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we want to follow the California model for America's economic future, with their high energy prices, the highest poverty rate in the country, and destructive economic policies driving businesses out of the State.

I think with Republicans' policies, it is very clear that we have the best interests of the people at heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act. I thank my good friend from Alabama for holding this debate.

You may not think of my home State of Idaho as a border State when you start thinking about border States, but Idaho is a border State. We share an international border with Canada in the northern panhandle of the State of Idaho.

There is a lot of timber on both sides of that borderline. Especially in a dry year like this—and this is going to be a dry year for us—it is not uncommon to have wildfire break out on one side or the other. It has happened many times before. Unfortunately, it will probably happen again, where, on the Canadian side, a wildfire breaks out.

Oftentimes, that smoke, those pollutants, blow right over the border, and there is absolutely nothing that the State of Idaho can do with that. Sometimes, we share some firefighting resources, but the bottom line is that it didn't break out in our forest.

It is true that the Clean Air Act has a provision to address that. What is not being brought up, at least consistently, is that there is also a conflict with that through the EPA. The EPA guidance, largely enforced with the previous administration, conflicts with the Clean Air Act provision allowing States to adjust their emission plans. Every time one of those fires breaks out, we become at risk of falling out of our emissions standards.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a pretty simple bill. All it does is ensure a fair

and consistent ability for these air quality designations to be put in place.

I stand in strong support of that. That is just one example. There are many other examples that some of my colleagues have brought up already.

It is not fair for States to be penalized for something that is out of their control. This simply takes steps in order to put fair and consistent air quality designations in place. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 6409, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The FENCES Act, Mr. Speaker, is a bad faith attempt by Republicans to use accounting gimmicks to make areas with bad air quality appear safe at the expense of our communities.

I hear from my Republican colleagues all the time that the Federal Government should be more transparent, but the literal and figurative smog that would be created by the FENCES Act will only make Americans sicker.

The FENCES Act goes an extra step to waive sanctions and fees for States, not just for international pollution but also pollution from mobile sources, exceptional events, and even from a different district within the same State.

In other words, the FENCES Act removes all incentives for States to work toward NAAQS attainment. This is a bad deal for the American people.

Every year, over 100,000 Americans die prematurely as a result of air pollution. Doctors and scientists widely consider foreign particulate matter to be one of the most toxic air pollutants, as it can cause asthma, COPD, heart disease, and certain types of cancer.

We can't just ignore air pollution and the very real health consequences that result from it to make permitting for industry easier. We shouldn't ignore the broader political landscape in which we are considering this bill, either.

Earlier this year, the EPA announced that it will no longer consider the benefits of protecting public health when developing new rules for fine particulate matter and ozone pollution. Instead, the EPA will only consider the compliance costs for industry.

This decision is entirely antithetical to the EPA's core mission to protect public health and the environment. The American people are asking us to lower healthcare costs, and our responsibility should be to them, not to the industry.

□ 1500

However, our Republican colleagues seem to only answer to their corporate polluter friends who are asking for regulatory rollbacks to save a few dollars. The DEFENSE Act is a gift to industry that would come at the expense of the American people.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the

DEFENSE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that no one wants polluted air and polluted water. We have made tremendous advances in pollution control. As a matter of fact, I worked for two international engineering companies, one of which was in environmental systems. We built the pollution control equipment that has made our air demonstrably cleaner. We built flue gas scrubbers. We built electrostatic precipitators and baghouses.

The technology has improved dramatically since I left my work in the field of engineering. Since 1980, we have reduced pollution from the six criteria gases monitored by the EPA by 78 percent. That is despite the fact that the economy has grown over 240 percent. That is \$2.9 trillion to an economy of \$30.6 trillion adjusted for inflation.

Vehicles miles driven are up 113 percent, and the population is up over 50 percent, yet we have seen remarkable improvements in air quality.

What we are trying to do with this long overdue effort to modernize the Clean Air Act is to not only continue to keep our air clean and our water clean, but to improve economic opportunity to people, particularly people who are disadvantaged such as I was growing up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to support this commonsense legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Min of CA moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6409 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MIN is as follows:

Mr. Min moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6409 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. LIMITATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, publishes a certification that implementation of this Act, and the amendments

made by this Act, will not increase, including for vulnerable populations such as seniors, children, and minority and low-income communities, any of the following:

- (1) Asthma attacks.
- (2) Hospitalization and emergency room visits for those with respiratory disease or cardiovascular disease.
- (3) The risk of preterm birth, babies born with low birth weight, or impaired fetal growth.
- (4) The risk of heart attacks, stroke, or premature death.
- (5) Reproductive, developmental, or other serious harms to human health.
- (6) The costs of healthcare treatment for respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, or any other serious disease or condition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6398

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing and Eliminating Duplicative Environmental Regulations Act" or the "RED Tape Act".

SEC. 2. POLICY REVIEW.

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
 - (A) by striking "and comment in writing" and inserting ", and comment in writing,";
 - (B) by striking "Administrator," and inserting "Administrator";
 - (C) by striking "(1)"; and
 - (D) by striking ", (2) newly authorized Federal projects for construction and any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190 applies, and (3) proposed regulations published by any department or agency of the Federal Government"; and
- (2) in subsection (b), by striking ", action, or regulation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6398.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act, which would address burdensome regulations in the Clean Air Act and provide the permitting reform needed to support American innovation.

The legislation, which was introduced by my friend Congressman JOHN JOYCE of Pennsylvania eliminates the duplicative requirement in the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to assess and provide feedback on environmental impact statements other agencies prepare under NEPA.

The primary agency preparing an environmental impact statement already possesses the expertise and resources necessary to evaluate the impacts of a project on our environment, and the EPA is often already involved in the NEPA review process as a cooperating agency. Requiring them to provide a secondary review under section 309 is unnecessary, duplicative, and inefficient, leading to more delays and higher costs for American job creators.

This legislation is an important step to streamline permitting, and it removes burdensome inefficiencies in the current NEPA process. This bill is an essential component in the committee's permitting reform efforts.

The Clean Air Act is long overdue for an update to eliminate outdated provisions that are holding back American manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the RED Tape Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6398, the so-called RED Tape Act. This bill deletes a section of the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to review major Federal projects under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. As a result, major Federal projects and regulations will be exempt from any scrutiny of their impacts on air quality and public health from EPA experts.

The bill would also make the permitting process less transparent by removing the requirements that EPA comments be made available to the public

and, therefore, communities would be kept in the dark.

Ignoring the consequences of major actions won't make them go away, but that is exactly what the RED Tape Act would do. For the communities who live near these major projects, turning a blind eye to problems won't protect their families from potentially toxic exposures.

Worse yet, the RED Tape Act is billed as permitting reform when in reality it is a bill to let polluters run amok out of sight from the public and without proper safety and common-sense guardrails.

Republican hypocrisy knows no bounds. They court the make America healthy again community, but then they move a bill forward that will take away the public's ability to simply know the potential toxic risks of large Federal projects. They then tout the importance of permitting reform but bring false permitting solutions to the floor instead of real proposals to make cleaner and cheaper energy sources more readily available to combat rising costs for Americans.

This hypocrisy is just one of the many problems we have to confront as the House is set to vote on these blatant attempts to gut the Clean Air Act, one of the most successful environmental and public health laws ever enacted by Congress. House Republicans are working overtime to further the Trump administration's efforts to silence the scientific, medical, and public health experts at EPA from being able to alert other agencies about how their projects might cause harm to the health of our constituents and our neighbors. That is the type of critical assessment that EPA's expertise alone could offer and would be missing as a result of this bill.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, they haven't offered any proof that these reviews were slowing or stopping projects. In fact, the EPA reviews thousands of environmental impact statements each year, with most other agencies taking their recommendations.

Unfortunately, by removing the EPA from the overall process, we are losing out on the expertise of the scientists tasked with protecting public health and the environment. However, to the Republican majority, if you can turn a blind eye to the consequences, they will disappear. Well, they don't disappear just because you turn a blind eye, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

That is not how toxic pollution works for countless communities in your district and mine. They deserve to know how large Federal projects might impact their water, air, and soil, and they deserve to have the best and brightest EPA scientists analyze these projects and make comments for the public to scrutinize and to hold the government accountable. Any attempts to remove this simple level of government accountability is an attempt to